

the arts of this country high honour and pre-eminence, your memorialists will ever pray.

R. W. Buss. F. Y. HURLSTONE.
S. BENDIXEN. JAMES FOGGO.
ALEX. BLAINLEY. GEO. FOGGO.
FORD M. BROWN. W. P. SALTER.
W. RIVIERE.

July 25th, 1845.

"Whitehall, 31st July, 1845.

"Sir,—I beg leave to acknowledge the receipt of your letter, accompanying a memorial, dated the 23rd instant, from numerous artists who are competitors for the decoration of the New Houses of Parliament, and who are exhibitors in Westminster Hall, recommending the division of the receipts of the exhibitions in Westminster Hall among the unworward candidates in each of such exhibitions.

I had the honour to submit the memorial in question to her Majesty's commissioners on the Fine Arts on the 23rd instant, when the commissioners, referring to their decision respecting similar applications in 1843, directed me to reply that they do not think it expedient to adopt the course suggested by the memorialists.—I am, Sir, your obedient servant,
C. L. EASTLARK, Sec.

F. Y. Hurlstone, Esq."

"7, Fitzroy-square, 31st July, 1845.

"Sir,—Herewith I have the honour to send you the answer which her Majesty's commissioners on the Fine Arts have directed me to return to the memorialists referred to in your letter, received on the 29th instant.

In further explanation I venture to state, that in consequence of various applications, similar in their object to that of the memorialists, during the exhibition in Westminster Hall, in 1843, the question respecting a division of the receipts of the exhibition was frequently submitted by me to the consideration of the commissioners.

This subject was, from first to last, considered to admit of discussion only in one form, viz., the appropriation of the net proceeds of the exhibition, after payment of the expenses.

The statement contained in the memorial, respecting the gross receipts of the exhibition, is incorrect. In 1843, instead of 2,900*l.*, the receipts were 2,472*l.* In 1844, instead of 1,400*l.*, the receipts of two exhibitions (in King-street and Westminster Hall) were 1,259*l.* 3*s.* The receipts of the present exhibition up to the 23rd instant are 638*l.* 8*s.* 6*d.*

The balance, after payment of the expenses incident to the exhibition in 1843, including 1,000*l.* in additional premiums, was 569*l.* 2*s.* 11*d.* In 1844, the expenses far exceeded the receipts of both exhibitions (the rent of the premises in King-street amounting alone to 850*l.*) That cost being defrayed by the Treasury, through the Office of Woods, the balance was 400*l.* 3*s.* 4*d.*

Before the exhibition took place, the cost of advertisements (with other expenses strictly relating to the exhibitions) was necessarily defrayed by the Treasury. Such expenses would, if enumerated, cause a further considerable reduction from the receipts. Again, the woodwork fittings in Westminster Hall, and in King-street, and the cost of the workmen employed on them, has not been defrayed from the receipts of the exhibitions.

This is the state of the case applicable to the view taken by the commissioners, and by the treasury, with regard to the proceeds of the exhibitions.

I have lately made application to the Treasury respecting the payment of the three premiums of 200*l.* each this year awarded. In the event of my receiving instructions to make such payment (600*l.*) from the fund arising from the present and the balance of the former exhibitions (amounting on the 31st instant) to 1,007*l.* 16*s.* 10*d.*, the balance at the close of the exhibition will probably be insufficient to cover the expenses.

It will be apparent that the Lords of the Treasury may justly require such payment to be made from the funds referred to, in consequence of having defrayed the extraordinary expenses above mentioned during the last year.

In entering into this explanation, I have perhaps taken a course unusual for official agents. I have done so on my own responsibility, from a desire to put the memorialists in

possession of the facts which, in the view of the commissioners, bear upon the question herein referred to.—I am, Sir, your obedient servant,
C. L. EASTLARK, Sec.
F. Y. Hurlstone, Esq."

The memorialists have since published the correspondence in the shape of a small pamphlet, and have added some remarks expressive of their disappointment, and their opinion that the expenses of the exhibitions should be defrayed by the nation.

"One small circumstance that concerns all the exhibitors must not be omitted. There is a principle, founded on equity, till now invariably maintained at our exhibitions, viz.: that every contributor shall have free admission, and be supplied with the catalogue that contains the account of his productions without charge. The royal commissioners alone have rejected this wholesome and just regulation; the charge of a shilling on the paying days, and of sixpence for the catalogue, has been exacted from the competitors; thus, regardless of their previous sacrifices and their rights, they have been made to contribute to the very last towards expenses over which they were allowed no control.* This has been the treatment of the artists; but that of members of both Houses of Parliament, of ministers and officers of state, of the high and puissant of this wealthy kingdom, has been more considerate; they were, to the number of 2,000, admitted gratuitously at the private view, and were presented with catalogues, for which they were not required to pay?

Is it love of money that induces artists to memorialise, or a desire for emulation and fame? Their past deeds must decide this question.† In the last century, when our artists first attempted exhibitions, the profits were given by them to public charities, and they received the grateful acknowledgments of the governors of the Foundling, the Middlesex, and other hospitals, for their generous liberality. In our own time, if parks are required for the health and recreation of the people; if literary and scientific institutions have to pay off a building debt, or to extend the means of their usefulness, an appeal to artists for disinterested assistance is never made in vain. At Manchester, Liverpool, Leeds, and other towns, the liberality of British artists is in this respect fully established. But how can they continue their voluntary exertions for the good of others, if a system is adopted that deprives them of all their means? If the example of the royal commission were followed, if its mode and measure of patronage and munificence were to be adopted by our corporate, parochial, and other authorities, what must be the fate of artists? In this model of encouragement at the conclusion of a great national experiment for the promotion of art and the introduction of the proudest style of historical painting, the outlay of a great nation is about one-half the actual expenses of artists who enthusiastically responded to the invitation of the royal commission."

Fresco Painting.—The Commissioners on the Fine Arts having received various applications from artists, candidates for employment as fresco painters, respecting the mode in which specimens of fresco painting may hereafter be submitted to them without reference to public exhibition, have issued a notice to the effect that such specimens may be sent to Westminster Hall from the 1st of March to the 1st of May next. The subjects and dimensions are left to the choice of artists, but those who have not previously exhibited are required to send specimens of drawing with their fresco paintings.

* If the royal commission had looked to parliament, as it should have done, for the expenses, the artists would have had no concern in them; but as the funds raised by the exhibition of their works are applied to the liquidation of those expenses, some control ought to have been allowed.

† The same love of art and desire for fame that impelled Barry and his contemporaries to offer to paint St. Paul's at their own expense would have induced the artists of the present day to nerve their energies and exhaust their means in the great experiment at Westminster Hall if no premiums had been offered by the royal commission. But however enduring their energies may be, their pecuniary means are limited; so they become exhausted, their zeal is rendered impotent, and the struggle for pre-eminence in historical composition hopeless. The principle recommended by the memorialists, of a self-supporting emulation, is surely the most economical, as it is the most effective mode of promoting genius.

ARCHITECTURE, A STUDY OF UNIVERSAL INTEREST.

THERE is no circumstance in the present period of architectural history so conducive to a future prosperous state of the art, as the increasing love of the study of it amongst those who are not practically engaged in the pursuit. The day may be far distant when the high and wealthy of the land will aspire, by a similar course, to attain to the eminence which the great Lord Burlington reached, not only by means of an arduous inquiry into the principles of the art, but by the labour of the craft; and it can hardly ever be deemed a wise proceeding to submit constructive details to the consideration of others than architects. But we deem that in the other department of the art no mistake has led to worse results, than that very common one, that architects must necessarily be the sole judges of architectural works. We hail, with pleasure, the increasing knowledge of ecclesiastical architecture, which has already done more towards the acquirement of correct principles in church building, than the years subsequent to the Reformation which preceded it. As already urged in this journal (*vide ante*, p. 385), a source of infinite pleasure is entirely lost, through the want of that knowledge which we recommend; one-half the page of history is blank to the tourist, who discovers nothing in the monuments of art, but their abstract forms. The collecting of stones and minerals, without a knowledge of the mighty revolutions in the earth's surface, and the component parts of the specimen, or the contemplation of the form of man, without the perception of the intellect, which animates and ennobles; these would be fit parallels for that state of ignorance to which non-professional persons have been for a long period ready to submit, and which professors have not desired to remove. Do the hundreds, that annually pass along the stream of the "exulting and bounding river" leave the scenery of their own islands unnoticed, because this is of inferior beauty, or rather for the sake of that interest, with which legends and the chroniclers of wars have invested the "chiefless castles" of the Rhine? But how much their interest would be enhanced could they feel that these "gay but leafy walls, where Ruin greenly dwells," contained "matter to be learned" more than cicerone and sight-seer think of, "sermons in stones," vocal of the customs and habits of centuries. The decorative character of an architectural work, the system adopted in points of detail, or the constructive arrangement, have more to tell, than the written chronicle, of the past. But it is not only the antiquarian part of the art, which might be studied with advantage; an earnest application to the theory, an elaborate study extending into all points of detail, could tend only to the improvement of architecture.

It would at least be some advantage if those who will probably always be the judges of architectural works, were acquainted with the mode of expression in plans and sections. Without this necessary knowledge, the member of a committee is quite unable even to know what is placed before him, and it is therefore the highest injustice that he should be allowed to sit in judgment. He is very much in the position of one who looks over a foreign author, without having opened a dictionary. But, much more than this is necessary; we wish that such an extent of information as the late Mr. Hope possessed, may become a thing of common occurrence rather than a solitary exception. Architects would then gain from those by whom entirely new ideas are most likely to be imparted, and architecture would no longer be "a thing of shreds and patches," but an art expressive of the state of national manners and acquirements. To praise any thing in such a building as Fonthill Abbey would now be deemed a proof of ignorance; yet the builder of that pile manifested that he was one of those who might have aided the art, though he was ignorant of the fashions in style. The architect has still more to do, though he may be well acquainted with the grammar of his art, and, however much the details of certain Gothic buildings, erected a short time since, are at variance with the original method, the whole conception is often grand and imposing. From their errors we may learn as much as from their successful features, and may discern the